REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-26 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-26 are rejected. Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17, 20-22, and 25-26 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17, 20-22, and 25-26 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating the informalities. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17, 20-22, and 25-26 to correct the informalities. As such, Applicants respectfully request the objections be removed.

Claim Rejections

102

Claims 1-5 and 17-19 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by White (2002/0049979 A1). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

> A method of streaming media, said method comprising:
> receiving a plurality of media streams, said plurality of media streams having a mutual downstream destination and a total bandwidth associated therewith;
> receiving information allowing identification of a selected media stream from said plurality of media streams;
> performing a service on each of said plurality of media streams except for said selected media stream, said service reducing a respective initial bandwidth of each of said plurality of media streams other than said selected media stream so that said total bandwidth is reduced; and
> streaming said plurality of media streams, wherein said plurality of media streams other than said selected media stream are streamed at less than their respective initial bandwidths.

Independent Claim 17 recites similar features. Claims 2-5, that depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 18-19 that depend from Independent Claim 17 also include these features.

MPEP §2131 provides:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that White is very different from the claimed embodiments and fails to teach or suggest each element of Independent Claim 1. Similarly, Applicants submit that White fails to teach or suggest the claimed features of Independent Claim 17.

Specifically, White fails to teach or suggest (emphasis added) "performing a service on each of said plurality of media streams except for said selected media stream, said service reducing a respective initial bandwidth of each of said plurality of media streams other than said selected media stream so that said total bandwidth is reduced," as claimed.

With the present invention, a service is performed on all of the media streams except the selected media stream, meaning the selected media stream is not altered. In opposition to this claimed feature, White in paragraph [0026] teaches "first as indicated by block 331, a low resolution version of each data stream is created. Creating a low resolution version of each data stream teaches away from "performing a service on each of said plurality of media streams

except for said selected media stream," as claimed. The present invention requires less processing since creating a low resolution version of the "selected stream" is not performed, as with White.

As such, Applicants submit that White fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of Independent Claims 1 and 17 and Applicants submit that Claims 1-5 and 17-19 are not anticipated by White. For the above presented rational, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

Claims 9-12, 14 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koto (2003/0058934). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 9 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

> A method of streaming media, said method comprising:
> receiving a plurality of media streams, said plurality of media streams having a mutual downstream destination and respective initial bandwidths associated therewith;
> performing a service on each of said plurality of media streams, said service reducing a respective initial bandwidth of each of said plurality of media streams;
> streaming said plurality of media streams at less than their respective initial bandwidths;
> selecting at least one media stream from said plurality of media streams; and

streaming said at least one media stream at its initial bandwidth.

Independent Claim 22 recites similar features. Claims 10-12, that depend from independent Claim 9 and Claims 23-24 that depend from Independent Claim 22 also include these features.

MPEP §2131 provides:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that Koto is very different from the claimed embodiments and fails to teach or suggest each element of Independent Claim 9. Similarly, Applicants submit that Koto fails to teach or suggest the claimed features of Independent Claim 22.

In particular, Applicants submit that Koto fails to teach "streaming said at least one media stream at its initial bandwidth," as claimed. Applicants underatand Koto to teach streaming compressed media streams. At the destination, a compressed media stream can be "expanded" (paragraph [0026]). At no point does Koto stream a media stream at its initial bandwidth, as claimed.

In paragraph [0022], Koto teaches "in the receiver side, the decoder 1-27 receives and expands any of the compressed data." With Koto all of the streams are compressed prior to streaming and are then streamed as compressed streams. In opposition, embodiments of the present invention stream a selected media stream at its initial bandwidth, meaning the stream is not compressed.

There is an important difference between a compressed stream and a stream at its initial bandwidth. With a compressed stream, a decoder is required to "decompress" the stream whereas with a stream at its initial bandwidth, a decoder is not required. Koto may teach decoding a compressed media stream, however, Koto fails to teach or suggest "streaming at least one media stream at its initial bandwidth," as claimed. Applicants submit that decoding a compressed media stream is not the same as "streaming at least one media stream at its initial bandwidth," as claimed.

As such, Applicants submit that Koto fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of Independent Claims 9 and 22 and Applicants submit that Claims 9-12, 14 and 22-24 are not anticipated by Koto. For the above presented rational, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

U.S.C. 103

Claims 7-8 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

As stated above, White fails to teach or suggest (emphasis added) "performing a service on each of said plurality of media streams except for said selected media stream, said service reducing a respective initial bandwidth of each of said plurality of media streams other than said selected media stream so that said total bandwidth is reduced," as claimed.

For the rational presented above regarding Independent Claims 1 and 17, Applicants submit that White fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of Independent Claims 1 and 17 and Applicants submit that Claims 7-8 and 20-21 are not anticipated by White. As such, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

Claims 13, 15-16 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koto in view of White. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, cited art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not whether each difference is obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole is obvious.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Koto and White does not teach, describe are suggest "streaming said plurality of media streams at less than their respective initial bandwidths and selecting at least one media stream from said plurality of media streams; and streaming said at least one media stream at its initial bandwidth because the combination of Koto and White does not satisfy the requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention (MPEP 2142). In particular, "if the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious" (emphasis added) (MPEP 2143.01; *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959)). Moreover, "[i]f the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed amendment" (emphasis

added) (MPEP 2143.01; *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

Applicants submit that the combination of Koto and White would render the invention of Koto unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. White teaches in paragraph [0023] "one stream is the images captured by "one" selected camera. The second stream consists of "thumbnails" (i.e. small low resolution images) of the images captured by each of the four cameras 102A to 102D." In essence, White streams all of the low resolution images in a single stream.

However, with Koto, the compressed images are streamed in separate streams. Applicants submit that the decoding performed with Koto (e.g., to decode a single stream) would not be operable with a single stream that includes a plurality of compressed streams from different sources.

As such, the invention of Koto would be rendered inoperable if combined with the teachings of White. For this rational, Applicants submit that Claims 13, 15-16 and 25-26 are patentable over Koto in view of White and request the rejection be removed.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koto in view of White. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

For the rational presented above, Applicants submit that invention of Koto would be rendered inoperable if combined with the teachings of White. For this rational, Applicants submit that Claim 6 is patentable over Koto in view of White and Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER L.L.P.

Dated: 10/12/2007

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Address: WAGNER BLECHER LLP
Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, California 95076
(408) 377-0500